UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/826,454	04/16/2004	Gregory J. LaRosa	M2051-701422	1309	
	7590	EXAMINER			
ONE MAIN ST	REET, SUITE 1100	DAHLE, CHUN WU			
CAMBRIDGE,	MA 02142		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1644		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/23/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@ll-a.com gengelson@ll-a.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
10/826,454		LAROSA ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	CHUN DAHLE	1644		

	CHUN DAHLE	1644	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION	ON IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWA	NCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cl periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of externinder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shate forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	n which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>06 May 2008</u>. A brief in date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or an Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	y extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37	7(e)), to avoid dismiss	al of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	sideration and/or search (see NOT /);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		'aral Madanana	Carana a Paras Osa
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). 		•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 11, 45, 47-52, 57, 58, and 60. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	oplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	da a NOT ala a tha analia tian in		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce pecause:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (Fig. 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Maher M. Haddad/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1644		

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, written description, new matter rejection .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments and the Examiner's rebuttal regarding the remaining rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are essentially same of record.

1.Claims 11, 45, 47, 48, 57, 58, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lind et al. (US Patent 6,084,075 Reference AA on IDS filed 04/16/2004) in view of Hardiman et al. (US Patent 7,115,379) for reasons of record.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but have not been found persuasive.

Once again, applicant argues that Lind et al. only teach antibodies that bind to the N-terminal domain of CCR2 wherein said antibodies are agonist of CCR2.

This is not found persuasive for reasons of record. Specifically, Lind et al. teach the make and use of antibodies to N-terminal domain of CCR2, as well as test for inhibitory/antagonistic antibodies. Thus, one of skill in the art would have been motivated to make inhibitory/antagonist antibodies to CCR2 based on the teachings of Lind et al.

Therefore, applicant's arguments have not been found persuasive.

2. Upon further consideration, the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, written description, new matter, has been withdrawn.